

## Remarks

Claims 4 and 5 are presently pending and stand rejected. Claims 1-3 and 6-11 are cancelled without prejudice. Claim 4 is amended.

Claim 4 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101. Examiner has indicated that claim 4 does not produce a “useful or tangible result” and that “the claimed invention is used for verifying unspecified condition of a system”.

Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection. It is noted that in claim 4, “verify the first system” and “verify the second system” are tangible and produces a result that has real world value because the “first circuitry” is physically configured to “realize” the “first system” and the “second circuitry” is physically configured to “realize” the “second system”.

Additionally, Assignee has amended claim 4 to recite “output port for providing verification results from the first circuitry”, and submits that “verification result” is now linked to the remaining limitations.

Claim 4 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Examiner has indicated that “it is unclear which ‘testing result’ referring to.” Office Action (OA) at 5. Assignee has amended claim 4 to recite “output port for providing *verification* results from the first circuitry”. It is believed that the foregoing particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter regarded as the invention.

Additionally, Examiner indicated that “It is unclear what applicants mean by ‘output’. Is it part of the ‘circuitry’ or ‘result’.” OA at 5. Assignee has amended claim 4 to recite, among other limitations, “output port” and it is believed that the foregoing properly clarifies what is meant.

Examiner also indicated that there is “no … link between each steps” and is “omitting essential structural cooperative relationships of elements”. Assignee respectfully traverse with regards to claim 4, because claims 4 recites, among other limitations, “the second circuitry connected to the first circuitry”.

Claim 4 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(f) on the grounds that “applicant did not invent the claimed subject matter”. However, Examiner has indicated that the “rejection may be overcome by evidence that applicant has somehow transformed the hardware emulator system of the prior art”. Assignee

respectfully submits that claim 4 recites a “hardware emulator”. When the “first circuitry” is “configured to realize and verify a first system” and when the “second circuitry” is “configured to realize and verify a second system”, the “hardware emulator” is transformed. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully traverses the rejection.

Claim 4 was also rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Rohlfleisch. Examiner has indicated that Rohfleisch discloses a system “a hardware emulator (See: Fig. 1 #110 and corresponding texts) comprising: A first circuitry configured to realize a first system on a chip (See: Fig. 1 # 104 and corresponding texts) … a second circuitry configured to realize a second system on another chip … (See: Fig. 1 #108 and corresponding texts).”

Assignee traverses the rejection because Rohlfleisch does not teach that Fig. 1 #110 is not a “hardware emulator”, but rather an “Emulation Interface Circuit”. Moreover, “Emulation Interface Circuit” does not comprise Fig 1 # 104, and Fig. 1 # 108.

Additionally, Assignee also traverses the rejection because Fig. 1, 110 and Fig. 1 #108 do not “realize the first system on a chip”, or “realize the second system on another chip”. Although “104 may provide access to the processor core 102”, this is different from “realize a first system”.

Finally, Assignee has amended claim 4 to recite that “the second circuitry directly connected to the first circuitry”. It is noted that Fig. 1 # 104 and #108 are not directly connected to each other. Accordingly, Assignee respectfully submits that claim 4 as now amended should be allowed.

Accordingly, Assignee respectfully requests that Examiner withdraw the rejection to claim 4 and dependent claim 5.

## **Conclusion**

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to the deposit account of McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Account No. 13-0017.

Date: July 17, 2008

Respectfully submitted,



Mirut Dalal  
ATTORNEY FOR ASSIGNEE  
Reg. No. 44,052

McAndrews, Held & Malloy, Ltd.  
500 West Madison – Suite 3400  
Chicago IL 60661

Phone (312) 775-8000  
FAX (312) 775-8100